

## **REMARKS**

In paragraph 8 of the final Office Action dated August 10, 2009, the Examiner indicated that claim 8 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 8 was dependent on claim 24, which was further dependent on base claim 7. Applicant cancels claims 8 and 24 and amends base claim 7 to include the limitations of claims 8 and 24. Accordingly, amended base claim 7 is equivalent to claim 8, if written in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 7 is therefore in a condition for allowance.

Applicant cancels claims 13 as being inconsistent with claim 7, as amended. Claim 30 is also canceled as being duplicative of claim 7, as amended. Claim 16 is amended so as to be consistent with claim 7, as amended.

In Paragraphs 5-7 of the Office Action, claims 7, 9-18 and 24-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first and second paragraph. These rejections are no longer applicable in view of the amendments to claim 7, which place it in a condition for allowance pursuant to Paragraph 8 of the Office Action.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully requests that this application be reconsidered and allowed. The amendments to the claims are appropriately made after final rejection, since they comply with Paragraph 8 of the Office Action in order to place the application in a condition for allowance.

Dated: August 19, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

/David J. Oldenkamp/  
David J. Oldenkamp, Reg.# 29,421  
Hexcel Corporation  
11711 Dublin Boulevard  
Dublin, CA 94568  
(925) 551-4900 x 4394 (Telephone)